



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,509	06/19/2001	Jeffrey A. Bedell	53470.003026	8697
21967	7590	09/30/2005		
HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1109				
			EXAMINER REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/883,509

Applicant(s)

BEDELL ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher A. Revak

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 6/19/01 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed July 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that Willens does not disclose of the use of an on-line analytical processing system wherein a report is presented to a user. The examiner respectfully disagrees. On page 1, lines 11-17, an on-line analytical processing system, or OLAP, is defined as being a system that "analyze the data from a number of different perspectives and support complex analyses against large input data sets". Based on this reasoning, the teachings of Willens discloses of a network access server contains user filters and sites for access that have been requested in the local cache that is used to obtain an access determination for user requests, see column 3, lines 18-23. It is further recited in the teachings of Willens that the network access server also handles monitored "kid" accounts as well as unrestricted "adult" adult accounts, see column 4, lines 46-57. The teachings of Willens demonstrate that multiple factors, or perspectives, such as child and adult accounts are used and that complex computations, such as filtering take place. Although the teachings of Willens do not specifically disclose the use of an OLAP, the functionality defined by the applicant's specification is anticipated by the teachings of Willens. Willens further recites of presenting the data, or report, to a user through a browser, or interface, see column 4, lines 58-62 and column 5, lines 9-21

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1,7, and 13 recite of a reporting system in the preamble and the bodies of the claims have been amended to include use of an on-line analytical processing system. It is unclear if the claims are directed towards a reporting system or an on-line analytical processing system.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1,7, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Willens, U.S. Patent 5,889,958.

As per claims 1,7, and 13, it is disclosed by Willens of a method, system, and processor readable medium comprising computer code for execution by a processor for implementing a security filter for regulating access to data associated with a network access server (reporting system/on-line analytical processing system)(col. 1, lines 6-13;

Art Unit: 2131

col. 2, lines 50-61; col. 3, lines 16-20 & col. 9, lines 17-20). A user is enabled to submit a password and profile (user identification) for a user request to a network access server (reporting system) wherein the user is identified based on their user profile (identification input), and then data is retrieved in accordance with the user request if authorized (col. 3, lines 16-20 & col. 5, lines 9-21). The retrieved data is filtered based on a security filter associated with the user profile (identified user)(col. 5, lines 9-21 & col. 5, line 58 through col. 6, line 5). The data (report) is presented to a user through a browser (user interface)(col. 4, lines 58-62 & col. 5, lines 9-21).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2-4,6,8-10,12,14-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willens, U.S. Patent 5,889,958 in view of Pennock et al, U.S. Patent 6,484,168.

As per claims 2-4,8-10, and 14-16, the teachings of Willens disclose of implementing a user security filter that filters requested data. The teachings of Willens fails to disclose that the security filter comprises a filter expression that specifies a subset of data in the database and has a top range and bottom range attribute that specifies the highest and lowest levels of analysis for applying the security filter. It is

Art Unit: 2131

disclosed by Pennock et al of word filters (filter expression) that determine a subset of topics (data)(col. 2, lines 59-66). A frequency filter determines the upper (highest) and lower frequency ranges (levels) that apply to the filtering the database (col. 3, lines 22-25). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated to apply expressions and ranges that help in filtering content for desired specifications. The motivational benefit of applying expressions and ranges is disclosed by Pennock et al wherein the content retrieved from a database is greatly reduced and information that is either not related or is redundantly recited is removed (col. 3, lines 46-53). It is obvious that the teachings of Pennock et al would have improved the teachings of Willens by setting ranges and expressions that is to be applied to the security filter wherein it would act more efficiently to remove unrelated data or redundant data that a user is not authorized to view.

As per claims 6,12, and 18, it is taught by Willens that the security filter varies by user and rules (fact element)(col. 5, lines 12-13 & col. 5, line 58 through col. 6, line 5).

8. Claims 5,11, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willens, U.S. Patent 5,889,958 in view of Reid et al, U.S. Patent 6,182,226.

The teachings of Willens disclose of implementing security filter that filters requested data based upon a user profile. The teachings of Willens are silent in disclosing that the user is associated with a group of users and applying a group level security filter. In a teaching by Reid et al, it is disclosed of a (group level) security filter that is applied to a connection and grouping users that have the same rights (col. 5,

lines 14-24 & col. 6, lines 39-41). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have been motivated group users with similar profiles into the same category for applying security rules. Reid et al discusses motivation for applying the grouping of users by reciting that user's have the same rights and can allow roaming users to be grouped into regions (col. 5, lines 14-24). It is obvious that the teachings of Willens could have been altered in order to allow for the grouping of users to form a group level security filter so that user's with the same rights can be grouped together as is disclosed by Reid et al.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR  
*CR*

September 28, 2005

Christopher Revak  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2131

*CR*  
9/28/05